

# NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

February 2, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

---

## *What Is the Republic?*

RUSSELL KIRK

## *"New Ideas" or Old Truth*

FRANK S. MEYER

## *Budgetary Elephantiasis*

L. BRENT BOZEIL

This document is part of an integrated file. If separated from the file it must be subjected to individual systematic review.

---

*Articles and Reviews by . . . . . WILLMOORE KENDALL*  
*WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM • E. V. KUEHNELT-LEDDIHN*  
*SAM M. JONES • ABE KALISH • BEN RAY REDMAN*

PAGES \_\_\_\_\_

DATE 12-01-97

JUB ~~Box~~ 78-01416R / BOX (02)

Folder # -8-

Fon # \_\_\_\_\_

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

BEST COPY

NEXT 3 PAGES

# NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley Jr.

## EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell James Burnham  
 John Chamberlain Willmoore Kendall  
 Guy Le Follette William S. Schlamm

**CPYRGHT** PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood  
 WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

## ASSOCIATES

Priscilla L. Buckley Frank S. Meyer  
 Jonathan Mitchell Morrie Ryskind

## CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorky, John  
 August Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman,  
 Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreutner,  
 J. B. Matthews, Gernart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver,  
 E. Merrill Root, Freida Utley, Richard M. Weaver,  
 Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

## FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

Göteborg: Wilhelm Poenike Madrid: J. Der  
 Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddin

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

## Contents

FEBRUARY 9, 1957 VOL. III, NO. 5

## THE WEEK

## ARTICLES

"New Ideas" and Truth Frank S. Meyer 116  
 What Is the Right? Russell Kirk 111  
 The First "R" Abe Kalish 114

## DEPARTMENTS

For the Record L. Brent Bozell 101  
 National Trend Sam M. Jones 106  
 From Washington: Straight Willmoore Kendall 109  
 The Liberal Life E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddin 110  
 Letter from Paris William S. Schlamm 115  
 Arts and Manners Willmoore Kendall 119  
 To the Editor

## BOOKS IN REVIEW

Splendid as Steel Teeth Willmoore Kendall 116  
 Many Poets and One Robert Phelps 117  
 Behind the Screen Ben Ray Redman 118  
 Review: Up-Belief Frank S. Meyer 118

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except second and third  
 years in April, at Orange, Conn., by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class  
 postage paid in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class  
 mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

## EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:

211 East 37th St.  
 New York 16, N.Y.  
 Telephone Murray Hill 2-9941

RENTALS: Twenty cents a copy, \$2.00 a year, \$13.00 for two years.  
 Foreign: Seven a year; Canada, \$8.00 a year.

The editor cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless  
 return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed.  
 Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the  
 views of the editors.

CPYRGHT *The WEEK*

\* It all began in the Summit Conference at Geneva, in the sunny days of 1955, at which it was resolved, one by one, to settle outstanding problems between East and West. Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson was detailed the minor chore of negotiating with Wang Ping-nan of Peiping the release of ten American civilians being illegally held in Red Chinese jails. Ambassador Johnson went to work immediately. Last week he announced that he has scheduled another conference for February 14—his 65th—and that reminded us that the time has come to urge our readers to send him a Second Annual Postcard (care of U.S. Embassy, Geneva)—we urged our readers to send the first a year ago—telling him never to give up the Alexis! You've got to give the spirit of Geneva a chance!

\* Senators Lehman and Douglas appear to be keenly aware of the same thing. NATIONAL REVIEW has been maintaining for several months—that in the next four years the serious political battles will not be between Republicans and Democrats but between Republicans and Republicans, and Democrats and Democrats. Senator Lehman, retired and long not very happy about it, accuses the Democrats of following a politically suicidal course. True, reaching for party unity, it failed to press the important civil rights legislation. He recommended that the new, self-constituted National Advisory Committee bypass congressional Democratic leaders by calling an annual convention, open to all Liberals. In which the paths of righteousness would be publicly illuminated. Senator Douglas was less oblique: instead of suggesting means of circumnavigating the conservatives, he simply proposed to leave the Democratic Party. Where would they go?

\* Buried beneath the Budget Message's mountains of words was a sentence that should be more conspicuously framed: "Legislation is recommended to authorize the TVA . . . to finance new generating facilities by the sale of revenue bonds." That is: "It is for the purpose of building new steam plants that private enterprise could and would eagerly construct if permitted to do so, is going to sell its own bonds to the public, outside of the regular structure of the national debt. The President has in the past declared his belief in the doctrine that government should do what the people cannot or will not do for themselves.

called the Princeton Fund, an organization which "devote its resources to the creation of a ready-to-fight army of American capitalism." To set the money aside is that the world's capitalistic "is used in Mr. CPYRGHT's perspective without the slightest hint of apathy. Mr. Robinson believes positively that "capitalism is a social vision far better than any of the current off-the-pulpit lectures that give the name of "democratic socialism" or the "middle way" or "Anaplan" or "orthodox." In Mr. Robbins' unblushing view, a decent capitalist has proved to be a good word."

\* That native Washington institution, The Cocktail Party, as stochastic, says Soviet Editor informs us. This is the view of the well-apprenticed Diner. To eat bread with the educated Republicans one must realize that there can be no Consensus candidate for the next election. It would start with the unpopularity of the New Rep. Administration, or, as Mr. Laddie himself, and not stop all along the "Very Old Highway," which is about as pleasant after dinner. We do not know, at this, about the "surfers," and so much the worse for the sellers, as though the steward had "dropped it" from the highway, and the "guitar," which New Rep. officials seem to think is where old Republicans ought to spend their time.

## *Having It Both Ways*

In the State of the Union message President Truman said that the budget for 1953 would be \$72 billion. The total White House budget was set at \$72 billion for 1952. The total budget of the Soviet Republics in 1952 was \$72 billion, or \$64 billion. Even \$72 billion, however, is still far over the sum for 1952 of the U.S. Government's spending in 1950, which was \$55 billion.

It is true, however, that the Soviet budget does not include the cost of the \$12 billion military assistance program that is to be given to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the other satellite states. This is something like a "frozen war." The communists, in fact, a technician, claims that the cost of the "satellite" can be halved to nothing. If so, it could take only a slight fall-off in population, and among the various Nations of Prussia, to get rid of the satellites, what the government spends would be \$12 billion less, and what a \$12 billion cut in the time may come under big budget-cutting arrangements to ease any further increase in the population of the satellite states, there is a slight cut in the cost of the satellite.

As a way of the present, Chairman Humphrey is caught in a position where an opportunity to make his record of past failures fail to come up front, your "British" if that is the way Mr. Humphrey feels to

himself, resists him not before calling the President's budget request. But not before calling the budget request to his 1952 Republican campaign promise "to cut federal spending to something like \$60 billion within four years."

## *Which End of the Telescope?*

A revision in the estimates of the rate of Soviet economic growth seems to be under way in both Washington and a number of the civilian research centers. This is a matter of more than abstract importance. American foreign policy is based, to a considerable degree, on the estimates of Soviet military and economic power.

In the past Soviet economic man has been painted on feet high. There have, of course, been fractional differences of opinion among the government and academic economists, but there has been general agreement on the broad dimensions of Soviet economic power.

This agreement no longer prevails. At the convention of the American Economic Association during the Christmas holidays, Professor Walter Nutter of the University of Virginia announced that the rate of Soviet economic growth was below that of the United States. This view will not, I, friendly receive from professional economists, if they are other than the expected and wealthy National Bureau of Economic Research.

There is, accordingly, some prospect that the gross errors of estimate that have been made over the past two decades may be corrected in the years to come. This will create quite a flattening. Washington's three-decade bubble especially, the Central Intelligence Agency, which has a very large number of citizens working on this problem, will have come to conclusions altogether different from Dr. Nutter's. Some additional point clearly those who have CIA Director Allen W. Dulles with the charge of being one of his most serious errors, will have to seek another source. Mr. Richard Bissell, who for fifteen years served from CIA to CIA after the 1952 election returns came in, may be one of those.

Central Intelligence, which has always taken a somewhat cynical view of the Germanium theory of the Soviet economy, regards the evidence of scientific progress. For one of our early studies we intended to obtain an estimate of Soviet economic capability that was within the bounds of reason. (See Mission report by Professor John H. Dunning.) This might be a good moment for the American periodical press to re-examine its performance on this question, and perhaps to correct the impression that it has so assiduously propagated for twenty years.

units of social existence. The pressure is in question, but was not compounded out of superstition or ignorance, but out of highly developed politics as to the essential integrity of the family, and out of a uncharitable concern over the victimization of innocent children and out of highly practical ideas as to the social utility of rearing young.

A society has two ways of defending its institutions when they are violated in extraneous ways, except through the mechanism of social sanctions against the violator. If the withholding from him of honor, of office, or a hint of disaffection, or pridefulness, can't restrain him, is it not time to protest the appearance of Mrs. K. humanely? And so it is done to give her space for the protest in which she made light of the issue. For those who believe have been ravaged by the "uncharitable" violations, and solidarity will be strengthened thereby; while Mr. Allende's administration, I am afraid, will be weakened due to the lack of the necessary contracts.

## Did CIA Take the Senate?

Two days ago, there had already published a "Report of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence." There were many statements in the report of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, and of the Research Center for International Studies at the Johns Hopkins Institute of Technology. An uncharitable version, admittedly, but one that the CIA has no argument to offer. The report is a good one, fair in its policies, and it makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of Washington over the last few years. It is a faultless document, written for the public good, and it seems to give undiminished support to the "Atoms for Peace" without reservation. The report is a good one, and need be nothing more than a "handbook for war."

The Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate has just issued a "Report and Study" concerning the CIA and its interests. Mysterious, indeed, the report is. It reveals all the salient features of the Agency because it is written in code. The CIA's back door is wide open, and it is impossible to tell what could be learned out of a single letter of the 10,000-word document. It could be a secret to the CIA, or RITT drugs, computers, and atomic bombs, for all we know.

But it seems that there are more to come, as the Project for International Studies, a cordial organization, has come along and it raised the money to put up the Central Intelligence Agency through its foundation in "confidence." Unless this project is to be taken over, the following schedule will be observed:

1. The CIA will be funded to CIA - CIA, giving CIA the right to spend its own money to widen the CIA's influence, thus some of the funds to create a

domestic research institution, the MIT Center, and the Center regularly publishes slanted books and articles, advocating particular policies for the U.S. 2. (Cont. 3) The Center, rating itself forward as a bona fide scientific outfit, will a Senate committee to have further funds with which to conduct a study of specific aid problems. 3) the Senate Committee agrees to The MIT Center obliges with a propaganda brochure.

For the men of the Foreign Relations Committee, it looks good as if you have been conned. Why not a few pertinent questions to Professors Max Millikan and W. W. Rossow, who authored the brochure, and their supporters?

## The Barrel's Bottom

Columbia University has created a "special faculty council" to study the "problems facing society as a result of the development of atomic energy"; and the press release accompanying the announcement shows how well the project is in good hands and that a lot of hard thinking has gone into the devising of it. One member of the council, for instance, is our old friend, Dr. Philip Jessup, who demonstrated his capacity to "dive deep into difficult problems way back in IPR days," besides which such distinguished academic disciplines as International Relations, Journalism and Business—along with such arts like Physics, Engineering, Medicine, Philosophy, and Law—are to be represented in its sessions.

They are going to proclaim Dr. Jessup with his unique set of pithouse, "to study this atomic age like the diamond cutters that we read about . . . to study the problems for a time to decide how to break them up into pieces that can be handled." Never before, however, does another counselor, effect, has a new kind of merit appeared so suddenly. "The big problem," goes still another, "is something we call 'international law.' That is, how do you find out how the international law is living up to the terms of the agreement?" And we want to know how an atomic armament agreement might affect international and domestic law and the American Constitution fit. It will be junked, of course!"

We have been hearing for some time of the frantic search for "projects" on which to spend the enormous amounts available for academic research. The news of Columbia's, therefore, reassuring. This project may have come from nowhere save the bottom of the barrel; there is very little left.

And with Millikan been inspired by his genius, we mourn the death of Arturo Toscanini. Next week, the *New York Times* will write an appreciation of the Maestro in his return.